SECRET EXCISE

EYES ONLY McGeorge Bundy from Bruce.

I am not sending this message, which concerns the Presidential trip, via State, since I think there should be no danger of dissemination, except as you might direct.

Obviously, in the present feverish atmosphere here, with the wildest allegations and rumors circulating, it is difficult to make any substantial judgment as to what may now occur in terms of the Prime Minister's continuance in office.

Under these circumstances, I think it would be inadvisable and impertinent for me to approach Macmillan personally on the subject. He is undergoing his own private Calvary, and must make his decisions in almost complete isolation.

On the other hand, I think the President should be aware that there is a possibility of his being confronted between now and his proposed arrival in England by a Parliamentary crisis of which he may have to take serious account.

Two courses of action may soon be suggested to the PM; first that he resign immediately: second, that he agree privately with Conservative Party leaders to resign at a definite date later in the year.

As regards the first alternative, I have been informed through an unimpeachable and authoritative source who enjoys Macmillan's complete confidence, that as of last night: "The PM will not resign until he is defeated in the House of Commons." As to the second, many Conservatives

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY [illegible] DATE 26 JAN 1982
PORTIONS DENIED AS INDICATED

DECLASSIFIED

would like to force him out in a matter of days, and certainly before Dr. Ward's trial commences on June 28, since they fear there may emerge during it shattering revelations of further iniquity in high places. But I would think that if the PM could stay on for a while, he would hope that his later withdrawal might be more gracefully accomplished, especially if there were any favorable results from the Soviet-American-UK discussions set for mid-July in Moscow, as well as because of a real desire to have what may be his last official conversation with the President.

My information about the possibility of this second alternative becoming operative is derived from a [redacted] source in which I place considerable though not entire reliance. At any rate, I would expect it to be outlined and expanded upon in one or more London newspapers tomorrow morning.

In order to place this affair in reasonable perspective, I shall have to comment on certain peculiarities of the British system of selecting and dismissing Prime Ministers, for they are somewhat alien to our own procedures.

The nine men (including Harold Macmillan) who have held the top leadership of the Conservative Party since Disraeli have been elected by acclamation; no ballot, nor any formal contest of any kind has ever taken place. Once agreement on a leader is obtained, the choice is informally ratified by the Conservative and Unionist members of the House of Commons

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED 133 81C

and the House of Lords (commonly called the 1922 Parliamentary Committee) and by the Executive Committee of the National Union (representing the party constituencies and branches). Once accorded, and if otherwise satisfactory to the party, the status of the party leader is not subject, as in the Labour Party, to annual election. In the circumstances, therefore, a Conservative leader, when the going is good, enjoys extraordinary personal power.

If the decision is made to replace a leader, as now seems the case with Macmillan, the process of "election" is in some ways reversed. Again, there is no ballot, nothing formal, but there is calculated chatter in the House of Commons, in the House of Lords, in drawing rooms, clubs, and corridors of power. It is communicated through a chain of invisible sanctions that give or deny the right to exercise supreme power in the Conservative Party. The Prime Minister does not need to be "confronted" by these dissidents, he knows their strength and numbers and influence through his own highly sensitive network of communications (the Whip's office in particular), through the circulation of gossip, hints, and innuendoes in the society in which he and his friends (and enemies) move, and, of course, the press.

Displacement of a Prime Minister can be effected with brutal swiftness once the voices have been harmonized and the decision reached to act. It is unlikely that any rejected Prime Minister can long prevail

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED P.S 1/33 81d

against the massive weight of an organized (and often apparently spontaneous) move to force him out. Macmillan is now in this position.

Voluntary retirement before his term, or enforced resignation of a Prime Minister (the two things usually are two sides of same coin) may or may not be accomplished by a move to dissolve Parliament and hold a general election. It is almost unthinkable in present circumstances that Macmillan would use the threat of dissolution to protect his personal position if he considered the position on other grounds to be completely undermined and impossible to defend. Also, this would not be sporting, nor fair to his still faithful supporters.

Now what bearing have these British political preoccupations and speculations on our own dispositions? I think the immediate connection is with the President's trip.

My recommendation is that the President play it cool, and evidence no outward curiosity about Macmillan's fate. If he leaves office before the President's arrival date, he will, I suppose, cancel the invitation for a stay at Birch Grove. If not, [redacted] I could arrange to have this done by Macmillan.

If the President were to initiate such a reversal of plans, Labour, Liberal, and Conservative would concert in an unholy alliance to construe this as an insult.

If Macmillan should leave office, and there were a replacement before the President's destined arrival, then there would be no reason for

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

the new Prime Minister to invite the President, or if he did so, for the President to accept.

I suggest that you might care to read Embtel 5130 to SecState, June 19.

In succeeding days, I shall send further word on developments.

DECLASSIFIED

7902932

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19122

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

1979 OCT -2 PM 3:10

reply to: 25 Elm Ridge Road
Pennington, New Jersey 08534
September 19, 1979

Mr. Frank Machak
Chief of Documents and Reference
Division of Foreign Affairs and Reference Service
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Freedom of Information Request

Dear Mr. Machak:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act as amended.

I am requesting access, for the purpose of a scholarly book I am writing, of the diaries of David K. E. Bruce for the period 1951-1974 and any related records. I believe that the amended act provides that if some portions of the diaries are exempt from access to scholars, the remainder will be made available. It also seems to me that this request fits the category of "furnishing information which can be considered as primarily benefiting the public," and so I hope we can work this out, at last, with some efficiency.

As provided for in the amended Act, I will expect to receive a reply within ten working days. If some of the material has already been cleared, I'd appreciate a chance to look at that. My telephone number is 609-737-1950, at Temple University, 215-787-1802.

Sincerely,

Joan Mellen

Joan Mellen
Professor

FOI 7902932
(BRUCE DIARIES)
PART V
JAN. 1963 - Sept. 1963
COPIES OF ONLY THE RELEASED DOCS (FULL + PART)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington, D.C. 20520

FOI CASE NO. 7902932 (Part V)

Professor Joan Mellen
25 Elm Ridge Road
Pennington, New Jersey 08534

Dear Professor Mellen:

I refer to your letter of September 19, 1979, requesting the release of certain Department of State documents under the Freedom of Information Act (Title 5 USC 552).

A search of files under the Department's control has resulted in the retrieval of 361 pages which appear relevant to your request. After careful review, we have determined that 262 of these pages can be released. Twenty-eight more can be released subject to excisions. Thirty-six must be withheld from release.

All the denied and excised material (unless otherwise specified below) has been determined to be properly exempt from release under Paragraph (b) (1) of Section 552 as currently and properly classified under Executive Order 12065 and authorized by that Order to remain protected in the interest of national defense or foreign policy. All non-exempt material in the excised documents that is reasonably segregable from the exempt material is released herewith.

It has been determined that the release of twenty-two pages must be denied under Paragraph (b) (6) of Section 552 as their release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The decision whether an additional thrity-five pages can be released requires coordination with another government agency. We will write to you again concerning that decision.

With respect to material denied or excised, you have the right to appeal this determination within 60 days. Appeals should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520. A letter of appeal should refer to the Freedom of Information case number shown above.

Sincerely,

For the Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Classification/Declassification

Scott Georg

For Thomas W. Ainsworth
Director, Mandatory Review
Bureau of Administration

APPEALS OF DENIAL OF ACCESS

(a) Review of an initial denial of access to a record under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552), the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC 552a), or Executive Order 12065 may be requested by the individual who submitted the initial request for access. The review (hereinafter referred to as the appeal) must be in writing and should be sent certified mail to the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Chairman, Appeals Review Panels, Department of State, 2201 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20520. The appeal should be received within 60 days of the date of the Department's refusal to grant access to a record in whole or in part.

(b) The time for decision on the appeal begins on the date the appeal is received by the Chairman, Appeals Review Panels. The appeal of a denial of access to records shall include any documentation, information and statements to support the individual's request for access and to refute the use of the exemption(s) cited in the Department's justification concerning the denial of access.

(c) The Chairman of the Appeals Review Panel or his designee and at least two other members of Panels designated by him shall constitute a panel to consider and decide the appeal; there shall be a written record of the reasons for the final determination. The final determination will be made within 30 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays), unless for good cause shown, the Chairman of the Appeals Review Panels extends such determination beyond the 30 day period.

(d) When the final determination is to grant access to the record in accordance with the individual's request, the Chairman of the Appeals Review Panel shall inform the office responsible for the record of its decision. The Chairman shall then request the Information and Privacy Coordinator to notify the individual in writing of the Panel's decision to grant access and at the same time to inform the individual of the Department's regulations concerning access. The individual shall choose the means of access most convenient to her or him.

(e) When the final decision of the Panel is to refuse to grant an individual access to a record, the Chairman of the Panel shall advise the individual in writing:

(1) of the refusal to grant the appeal and the reasons therefor including the exemptions of the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act of 1974, and Executive Order 12065 under which access is denied;

(2) of her of of his right to seek judicial review of the Department's decision.